

REMARKS

The final Office Action mailed June 14, 2007 has been carefully reviewed and the foregoing amendment has been made in consequence thereof.

Claims 1-4 and 6-20 are now pending in this application. Claims 1 and 3-9 stand rejected. Claims 10-20 are allowed.

Applicants note that Claims 6 and 9 are rejected. In the previous Office Action dated January 4, 2007, Claims 6 and 9 were indicated as being withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner. Applicants respond herein to the rejection of Claims 6 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as recited on page 2 of the final Office Action.

Moreover, Applicants note that in the previous Office Action dated January 4, 2007, Claim 2 was objected to. However, the Examiner indicated that Claim 2 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In response to the previous Office Action, Claim 2 was rewritten in independent form to include all the limitations of independent Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectively submit that Claim 2 is allowable.

The rejection of Claims 1 and 3-9 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite is respectfully traversed.

Applicants acknowledge and thank the Examiner for the indication that Claims 1 and 3-9 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite “at least one dispenser comprising a first tube coupled with respect to a first aperture of said plurality of apertures and a second tube coupled with respect to a second aperture of said plurality of apertures, ...” Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1, as amended, satisfies the requirements of Section 112.

Claims 3-9 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 1. When the recitations of Claims 3-9 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 1, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 3-9 likewise satisfy the requirements of Section 112.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 112 rejection of Claims 1 and 3-9 be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, all the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Eric T. Krischke
Registration No. 42,769
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740
(314) 621-5070